REMARKS

Claims 1 to 10 are retained in this application.

The specification has been amended as required.

Claims 1, 4, 6 and 7 have been amended to remove the objections thereto.

Claims 1 to 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawashima (U.S. 6,549,757) in view of Arnold et al. (U.S. 5,908,997). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 requires, among other steps, the step of interrogating the flash memory via the GPP to open a MIDI bit stream and determine sample sets to be loaded into a DSP memory associated with the DSP. No such step is taught or suggested by Kawashima, Arnold et al. or any proper combination of these references either alone or in the combination as claimed. Not only is the tone generator of Kawashima not stated to be a DSP, but, in addition the claimed function ascribed to this step is nowhere found in Kawashima. Arnold et al. fails to remedy this matter.

Claim 1 further requires the step of loading and instantiating via the GPP, a DSP code associated with the sample sets into the DSP memory. . No such step is taught or suggested by Kawashima, Arnold et al. or any proper combination of these references either alone or in the combination as claimed.

Claim 1 yet further requires the steps of initializing a sample set memory and signaling the DSP to start running a DSP synthesizer, parsing the MIDI bit stream into synthesis packets comprising MIDI commands via the GPP; transferring the synthesis packets to the DSP via the GPP; and time stamping and synthesizing the MIDI commands via the DSP to render audio signals to the DAC. . No such steps are taught or suggested by Kawashima, Arnold et al. or any proper combination of these references either alone or in the combination as claimed.

In the event the rejection is repeated, it is requested that the examiner specifically show not only that similar structure is present, but also that the claimed function applied to each method step is present.

Claim 4 sets forth features as discussed above with reference to claim 1 and accordingly the arguments presented above with reference to claim 1 apply and are incorporated by reference.

Claims 2 and 3 depend from claim 1 and claim 5 depends from claim 4 and these claims therefore define patentably over the cited references for at leas the reasons presented above with reference to the claims from which they depend.

Claims 6 and 7 require, among other features, at least one DSP peripheral device operative to drive the DAC; and a general purpose processor (GPP) configured to read and parse the MIDI files stored in the flash memory to generate MIDI synthesizer commands therefrom, the DSP responsive to the MIDI synthesizer commands to synthesize audio signals and render the audio signals to the DAC via the at least one DSP peripheral device to implement a MIDI synthesizer. The arguments presented above with reference to claim 1 applies as well to this claim other than the fact that it is in structure format.

Claims 8 to 10 depend from claim 7 and therefore define patentably over the applied references for at least the reasons presented above with reference to claim 7.

In view of the above remarks, favorable reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Jay M. Cantor
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 19,906

Texas Instruments Incorporated
P. O. Box 655474, MS 3999
Dallas, Texas 75265
(301) 424-0355 (Phone)
(972) 917-5293 (Phone)
(301) 279-0038 (Fax)